Under the Paper	work Reduction Act of	1995, no persor	s are required to re	U.S. Patent and Tr	rademark Offic	use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031 pe: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE nless it displays a valid OMB control number.	
, RET	Application Number		10/773	10/773349			
			Filing Date		Februa	February 6, 2004	
FORM			First Named Inventor Cu		Curt D.	Gilmore	
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)			Art Unit		2125	2125	
			Examiner	Name	Kidest	Bahta	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission 6			Attorney D	ocket Number	9895-0	00001	
ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)							
Fee Transmittal Form		Drawing(s)			After Allowance Communication to Technology Center (TC)		
Fee Attached		Licensing-related Papers			Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences		
Amendment / Reply		Petition			Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)		
After Final		Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application		Prop	Proprietary Information		
Affidavits/declaration(s)		Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address		☐ Stat	Status Letter		
Extension of Time Request		Terminal Disclaimer			Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):		
Express Abandonment Request		Request for Refund  CD, Number of CD(s)			Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance; Acknowledgment Postcard		
Information Disclosure Statement							
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)		Remarks  The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 08-0750. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.					
Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application		The state of the s					
Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53							
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT							
Firm or Ha Individual name	or Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.0		Attorney Name Joseph R. Papp			Reg. No. 20115	
Signature Signature							
Date December 3, 2004							
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING							
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.							
Typed or printed name  Joseph R. Papp  Express Mail Label No.  Express Mail Label No.							

Signature December 3, 2004 Date This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.





## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**Application No.:** 

10/773349

Filing Date:

February 6, 2004

Applicant:

Curt D. Gilmore, et al

Group Art Unit:

2125

Examiner:

Kidest Bahta

Title:

Error Proofing System For Portable Tools

Attorney Docket:

9895-000001

Mail Stop Issue Fee Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## **COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

Sir:

Reasons for allowance are only warranted in instances in which "the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear [the Examiner's] reasons for allowing a claim or claims." 37 C.F.R. 1.104 (e). In the present case, Applicant believes the record as a whole makes clear the reasons for allowance and therefore no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted, especially since the statement may unfairly focus on certain reasons for allowance which are not reflected by the prosecution history. Therefore, the record should reflect that Applicant does not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance. For example, while Applicant believes the claims are allowable, Applicant may not unequivocally agree that patentability resides solely in the specific feature or combination of features identified, or that each feature or combination of features identified, or that equivalents of any

of the recited features are outside the scope of the claims. Moreover, to the extent the reasons for allowance do not separately address the subject matter of all the claims, Applicant does not acquiesce to any inference that the non-addressed claims fail to present other reasons for patentability apart from the patentability of the claims which were specifically addressed by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph R. Papp, Reg No. 20115 HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

Attorneys for Applicants

Dated: December 3, 2004

P.O. Box 828 Bloomfield Hills, Mi. 48303 248-641-1600

9895-000001